

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15-20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 34-39, 41-55, and 59-61, 64, and 65 are presently pending. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15-20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 34-39, 41-55, and 61 are amended herein; claims 3, 9, 23, 24, 28, 56, 62, and 63 are cancelled herein; and new claims 66-68 are added herein..

Formal Request for an Interview

[0005] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0006] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0007] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15-20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 34-39, 41-55, and 61 herein.

[0008] Furthermore, Applicant adds new claims 66-68 herein. These new claims are fully supported by the Application and therefore do not constitute new matter.

Formal Matters

[0009] This section addresses any formal matters (e.g., objections) raised by the Examiner.

Claims

[0010] The Examiner objects to claim 27 for containing two typographical errors. Herein, Applicant amends claim 27, as shown above, to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112

[0011] Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 12, 15-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 34-39, 41-56, and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6, 20, 25, 39, 47, 54, and 61.

[0012] In particular, regarding claims 6, 20, 25, 39, 47, 54, and 61, the Examiner indicates that each of these claims reflects the limitation of rounding the display coordinates of the target graphic object to an integer value in order to output it on a target screen to be displayed, but that the claimed resizing followed by the mathematical process of rounding may cause one or more of the target object's coordinates to be out of the bounds of the target screen.

[0013] Applicant respectfully disagrees, and would like to point out that according to the resizing process described in the claims, resizing an original object having coordinates within the bounds of the original screen will not result in a target object having coordinates outside the bounds of the target screen. Accordingly, the Examiner's contention that rounding subsequent to the resizing may cause one or more of the target object's coordinates to be out of the bounds of the target screen is incorrect. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 112 rejection of these claims be withdrawn. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, then Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner

provide a specific example that conforms with the language of the claims and results in a target object's coordinates being out of the bounds of the target screen.

[0014] Regarding claims 1, 8-10, 22, 27-29, and 55, the Examiner rejects the claims as indefinite for including the term, "substantially". In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 112 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

[0015] Regarding claims 41-47, 48-54, 56, 61, and 62, the examiner states that claims 56 and 62 recite the limitation, "proportionately wider" and claim 61 (Applicant assumes the Examiner meant claim "41") recites the limitation, "proportionately higher". Applicant submits that the intention of these phrases may have been more clearly understood by replacing the term "proportionately" with the term "disproportionately."

[0016] The amended claims, as shown above do not include the terms "proportionately wider" or "proportionately higher", rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 112 rejection of these claims.

[0017] Regarding claim 22, the Examiner states that the claim recites an element for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended this claim, as shown above, to correct the deficiency noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 112 rejection of the claim 22.

Claim Rejections under §103

[0018] Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 12, 15-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 34-39, 41-56, and 59-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0019] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone and/or in combination:

- **Kataoka:** *Kataoka, et al.*, US Patent No. 7,216,293; and
- **Qureshi:** *Qureshi, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,456,305.

Overview of the Application

[0020] The Application describes a technology for transforming a display for an original screen to a display for a target screen, wherein the original screen and the target screen have different aspect ratios. Data objects on the original screen are first proportionally resized, and then stretched in the direction in which the target screen is disproportionately larger than the original screen.

Cited References

[0021] The Examiner cites Kataoka as the primary reference and Qureshi as the secondary reference in the obviousness-based rejection.

Kataoka

[0022] Kataoka describes a technology for redesigning a screen depending on change in a display size of the screen so that a size and/or position of a GUI part on the screen is also changed to enable improved productivity.

Qureshi

[0023] Qureshi describes a technology for automatically sizing and positioning a graphical display of HTML objects to fit the dimensions and video display resolution of a display window in a program such as a browser.

Obviousness Rejections

Based upon Kataoka and Qureshi

[0024] The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 12, 15-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 34-39, 41-56, and 59-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kataoka in view of Qureshi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0025] Claims 3, 9, 23, 24, 28, 56, 62, and 63 are cancelled herein, rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

[0026] Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 39, 41, 47, 48, 54, and 55, 61 are amended herein, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. For example, claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 39, 41, 47, 48, 54, and 55 have been amended to include details regarding the calculation of target display coordinates. Such calculations are not disclosed in the cited references.

[0027] Dependent Claims 2, 12, 15-19, 31, 34-38, 42-46, 49-53, 59, 60, 64, and 65 ultimately depend upon one of the above-referenced amended independent claims. As discussed above, the 103 rejections of the independent claims are moot. Accordingly, the rejections of these dependent claims are also moot.

Dependent Claims

[0028] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0029] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12/19/07

By: Kayla D. Brant

Kayla D. Brant
Reg. No. 46576
(509) 324-9256 x242
kayla@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com